Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : [redacted] 25X1A9a

FROM : [redacted]

DATE: 5 July 1950

SUBJECT: Comment on [redacted] 25X1X7

25X1X7 1. The following report on the procedure by which CIA prepares comments on [redacted] papers is submitted in order to clarify the present situation and to suggest a basis for continuing this operation.

I. Background.

25X1A

2. In November 1948, on the suggestion of [redacted] 25X1A9a undertook to have developed an ORE procedure for regular comment by CIA on [redacted] 25X1X7 intelligence papers. The task of studying the problem and outlining a procedure was given to the Staff Intelligence Group. Within G/SI, I was given the responsibility of developing the problem. A study was made of [redacted] papers then on 25X1X7 hand to determine which, if any should be commented on at the outset; no decision was made to comment on the 23 papers suggested for this treatment. A procedure was also developed for handling [redacted] papers as they are received, and was 25X1X7 employed in March 1949, even before the procedure was promulgated on 25 April as ORE Operating Procedure No. 6. In this procedure, G/SI was given the major role of initiating comment, on the assumption, since proved unsound, that in the course of its planning functions G/SI would be carefully perusing all [redacted] documents 25X1X7 and could speedily indicate those upon which comment would be useful.

II. Report on Comments Forwarded.

3. Despite the original intention to prepare and forward CIA comments once a quarter, only two sets of routine comments have so far gone forward:

IM-138, dated 4 March 1949, contained comments on 3 documents, and acknowledged no others;

IM-224, dated 21 September 1949, contained comments on 4 documents and acknowledged 3 others.

25X1X7 4. In addition to routine comments, listed above, CIA has of course prepared other comments on [redacted] papers upon specific request. These are not listed in this report.

5. There are at present in the files of D/Pub 8 comments dating from 18 October 1949 to 31 May 1950 which have not yet been forwarded. Of these, because of the ephemeral nature of the reports commented on or because of the trend of events, it is suggested that only 3 should be forwarded to [redacted] at this time. 25X1X7

6. A word of explanation is called for on D/Pub's unimpressive performance in getting ORE comments to ██████████ 25X1X7

    a. This matter has inevitably been one of low priority in an office busy with other things; twice in the past 8 months (in December 1949 and again in April 1950) items were collected for forwarding but could not be processed;

    b. The close review of ████████ publications on which D/Pub's decisions 25X1X7 on comments had to be based, proved impossible in the face of more pressing matters;

    c. The change in the routing procedure in October 1949 deprived D/Pub of its position of prescribing the routing to be given. Because of its frequently low position on the distribution lists for these documents, D/Pub has generally had only a post facto ability to indicate where comments might be made. In the elapse of time, the value of requested comments had materially declined.

III. Suggestion for Procedure.

7. ORE Operating Procedure No. 6 of 25 April 1949 should be fundamentally revised.

8. The following specific suggestions, together with the reasons therefor, are made:

    a. Reference to D/Pub's routing of ████████ documents should be stricken, 25X1X7 in view of the recission of these portions of ORE Operating Procedure No. 28 (dated 26 January 1949) which referred to ████████ documents. 25X1X7

    b. If it is desired that D/Pub continue to exercise the "monitoring function" set forth in Operating Procedure No. 6, it is essential that D/Pub be placed at the top of the distribution of each document.

    c. The full initiative and responsibility for deciding whether comments on a specific paper should be made by ORE should not rest with D/Pub, but should be jointly shared by D/Pub and the substantive divisions. In most instances, the divisions are in a far better position to decide, on the basis of the information they possess, whether comment is warranted. The procedure should therefore be rephrased to provide that divisions may, on their own initiative, send in comments in the prescribed form.

    d. The mechanical procedure set forth in II. 2. of Operating Procedure No. 6 can be retained, subject to grammatical rearrangement.

    e. The phrase "... and of the US Government." in II. 3. of Operating Procedure No. 6 should be omitted, to avoid any impression that these comments are coordinated throughout the intelligence structure of the US Government. The types of comment indicated for inclusion and avoidance are essentially those initially suggested by ████████████ and should remain unchanged.

25X1A9a

- 2 -

IV. General Remarks.

9. Extent of commenting procedure. It has been suggested that all

25X1X7 papers should receive ORE comments. On the basis of past experience it appears that perhaps one in five documents received from [ ] merit 25X1X7 this comment, and that in 80 percent of the documents, formal acknowledgement and note of agreement would be all that we could make. This would appear to be doubtful value, particularly in those cases in which the papers are simply reports or numbers in report series. I would suggest that comment be restricted to those papers which are essentially of estimate or basic intelligence character and, beyond that, to those instances in which we would be of some 25X1X7 help in providing [ ] certain information which they apparently do not possess.

10. Timing of comments. It has been suggested that comments on [ ] 25X1X7 papers be forwarded as they are received. In the past, the frequency of those papers upon which comments were warranted suggested combining these comments for forwarding about once a quarter. Undoubtedly, however, a different procedure could be worked out if it were desired to send the comments on at once.

25X1A9a